

For use by the Shoreline Preservation Task Force,

As a follow-up to the Task Force meeting on Monday night regarding my presentation, I have compiled a selection of web sites and information that may be useful in understanding there is a different side of sea level rise and climate change of which they were unaware.

I have a few comments regarding the above subject before getting to the references.

I should clarify my statements regarding my Solar Discussion forum. The forum is composed of various disciplines concerned with the Sun, its construction and its effects on our planet including climate, sea level, and even tectonic and volcanic activity. Within the forum, many hypotheses are discussed and tested. Until the information regarding these activities is verified, there can be no public disclosure. The second issue is that nobody on this committee would be able to understand correctly what is being discussed. Here is an example of a discussion that was recently made public by one of my scientists:

"Multi-moment, multi-scale spatiotemporal integration reveals nonrandom harmonic pattern-summary discontinuities, exposing the comedy tragically advocated by deceitful &/or naive theoreticians who are in part constrained by a dominant culture that clings seemingly religiously to maladaptive traditions such as unjustifiable assumptions of randomness, independence, uniformity, linearity, etc. that are routinely misapplied (for example to conveniently render abstract conceptions mathematically tractable)."

I rest my case.

In my presentation I indicated that the Nature Conservancy had held back information that they could later use for what is currently an unknown purpose. They are working actively with the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) and the chart they presented to the town of Guilford was a cropped version, 1 meter in 2080, of a chart developed by the head of GISS, James Hansen, that continued to 2100 and 4 meters more sea level rise in the next 20 years. That amounts to approximately 16 feet plus a value for storm surge. This rise is considered "almost certain" according to the paper "Paleoclimate Implications of Human Caused Climate Change". This is completely outside the most ridiculous of the prognostications currently out there. Mr. Sutherland needs to respond to this question.

It is quite obvious that the Nature Conservancy has controlled the scientific discussion on this question from the beginning, including the Co-chair of the Governor's steering committee. I am sure it makes it easier to make your point without opposition. Given the vast expenditures associated with Anthropogenic (Man-made) Global Warming (AGW) and Sea Level Rise (SLR) it should be considered prudent to fully understand all sides of the science. It was quite obvious to me, and others, that Mr. Sutherland did not want me to supply the committee with counter information. At least one recommended resource was lambasted by TNC web site for a completely false reason. That was Professor Bob Carter from Australia. I wrote to Bob and told him of the discussion. He has been vilified by many and considers that he must be doing something right to have such attention.

Professor Larry Gould-

Physicist, University of Hartford, Member of Connecticut Climate Realists

This is a group of scientists and engineers in the climate and related disciplines. The group would be pleased to make a presentation to your committee I am sure. His web site is:

<http://uhaweb.hartford.edu/LGOULD/> His email is: lgouldphys@gmail.com I was a member of the group until recently but their focus was somewhat outside of my interests. A member of this group you may know is Art Horn, a former Channel 30 meteorologist.

Professor Bob Carter:

Professor Bob Carter is an adjunct Research Fellow at James Cook University (Queensland). He is a palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist with more than 40 years professional experience, James Cook University (Townsville), where he was Professor and Head of School of Earth Sciences between 1981 and 1999.

1. Half of Chapter 4 in my book, Climate: the Counter Consensus (ordering information here: http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1a_CTCC.htm) Sorry, but the book will cost you.

2. A summary paper I prepared in connection with a court case, item 136 on the list of articles here: http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1.htm

The web site is full of excellent information on a variety of subjects. The videos are informative and entertaining.

3. The two papers at the link below John Droz, who has just taken a lot of trouble to review sea level change on the eastern US seabord.

Physicist John Droz of North Carolina

From John Droz, "Following that same philosophy, my two part critique of the 2010 NC "Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report" has just been officially released, so feel free to pass it on to science-oriented parties interested in the sea level rise issue: <<<http://tinyurl.com/4lns7wy>>>."

"The basic theme of my critique is that the **methodology** used in the NC report was fundamentally and fatally flawed." Their website is [here](#).

This is a guest post in Anthony Watts, most read climate blog in the world by John Droz Jr. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/06/11/science-vs-agw-advocacy-in-north-carolina/>

The North Carolina legislature is working to define how sea level needs to be evaluated because they were misled by certain individuals. The recent story about the Eastern seaboard "Hot Spot" incorporates some of these false predictions.

Anthony Watts-Meteorologist

WattsUp With That is an excellent source of information on all subjects Climate related. Became famous for his analysis of US temperature monitoring stations. Approximately 17% met minimum standards. The rest didn't.

Kirtland Griffin, National Environmental Policy Examiner

There are over 70 articles [here](#). On the second page is an interview with astrophysicist Piers Corbyn of www.WeatherAction.com He is the long range Solar/Lunar weather and climate predictor. There are some articles associated with my folks on "It's the Sun" discussion forum.

Bob Tisdale on ocean heat etc.

I am somewhat reluctant to offer this one as it can be pretty technical. It is about Ocean temperatures and ocean heat content mostly. There is a response here to the so-called Hot Spot report in the Eastern US. <http://bobtisdale.wordpress.com/>

Piers Corbyn, Astrophysicist www.WeatherAction.com

The ultimate weather and climate forecaster. Due to my close (non-financial) association with Piers, I should be able to get you a forecast for free. Piers publishes an Extreme weather forecast each month for the US and an annual Hurricane forecast. His work shows demonstrated skill over years but unfortunately his forecasts are "not lasers but rather a lamp to show the way", in his words. The predictions he has made correctly cannot be put off as being coincidence or so general as to be something likely to happen anyhow. For instance, his seasonal forecast for Europe said it would be extremely cold when the Met Office, the official British Weather Service, said it would be mild. He was right. His other forecasts are more specific to location and date.

Solar Cycle 25

Last but not least is this site that discusses much of the same type of material as in my Solar Forum. We are in solar cycle 24 and its maximum is about 3 years away. It is on track to be one of the smallest, in terms of amplitude, in over 100 years.

Solar Cycle 25: <http://sc25.com/>

I hope I have not overwhelmed the committee with this list. There is so much more.

It is important to understand that the Sun was ruled out as a cause for our recent warming because the IPCC only considered solar irradiance, otherwise known as the solar constant. This determination was made by one solar physicist, Judith Lean, based on some very dodgy science. The alternating magnetic fields have a far greater effect on our climate. Then there is the epitrochoidal orbit of the sun caused the angular momentum of the planets in a 179 year cycle..... Best left for another time.

The IPCC was charged with determining HOW man was influencing the climate not IF. That was their original charge. When the IPCC writes Assessment Reports, they send out the document for review. When they receive the comments, both positive and negative, they may accept or reject any or all. 57% of the negative comments in AR4 were rejected in the critical chapter on the scientific basis without any reason given. The next step is to write the Summary for Policy Makers. It is written by Policy Makers, not necessarily scientists. This report is voted on and issued with **absolutely no review**. The really amazing part is that the next several months are spent going over the huge AR report and **eliminating anything that conflicts with the political document**. That process was in place for all 4 of the previous reports and it was available for all to see on the IPCC website. It has since been removed when people like me pointed it out to the world.

The objective of my research into this debate is to point out that warming is not a likely part of our future. Neither is Sea Level Rise or ocean acidification or a need to cut carbon emissions. When the Sun goes into Solar Cycle 25 the planet will likely go into a very cold phase even beyond that experienced in the rest of the world this past winter. Most solar scientists see this cold spell lasting 100 years or more. Some say Solar Cycle 25 may not even happen for several decades. That would be very serious. Cutting carbon emissions by phasing out coal fired plants that supply more than 50% of the electricity in the US will reduce available power when it will be needed most. Cutting CO2 emissions will do nothing to help the planet. It could reduce the population some.

The only real "evidence" for man made global warming is mathematical models. The head of the IPCC research group, Phil Jones, said in an email exposed last year that none of the models work due to how they handle clouds. He was absolutely correct. Johnathan Shanklin, head of the British Antarctic Survey team meteorology unit, told me the same thing a couple years ago relative to his work. Ask anyone how they know that CO2 emitted by man actually caused the warming that ended about 2002. If they give you an answer, it will likely be the models, that don't work, or it can't be the Sun. Neither is satisfactory. I have invited the head of the GISS, James Hansen, to debate Lord Monckton of Scotland. Lord Monckton was looking forward to it but only Hansen's assistant emailed me asking if her boss had responded. I told her "No", and that was the last I heard from them. So much for open communications...

I would be happy to conduct a presentation to the group on any subject covered here. I am currently working 2 days a week so I am flexible. I can also supply experts on the various subjects.

Yours truly,

Kirtland C. Griffin

638 West Lake Ave.

Guilford, CT 06437

203 453 2793 Home

203 927 1675Cell

For use by the Shoreline Preservation Task Force,

As a follow-up to the Task Force meeting on Monday night regarding my presentation, I have compiled a selection of web sites and information that may be useful in understanding there is a different side of sea level rise and climate change of which they were unaware.

I have a few comments regarding the above subject before getting to the references.

I should clarify my statements regarding my Solar Discussion forum. The forum is composed of various disciplines concerned with the Sun, its construction and its effects on our planet including climate, sea level, and even tectonic and volcanic activity. Within the forum, many hypotheses are discussed and tested. Until the information regarding these activities is verified, there can be no public disclosure. The second issue is that nobody on this committee would be able to understand correctly what is being discussed. Here is an example of a discussion that was recently made public by one of my scientists:

"Multi-moment, multi-scale spatiotemporal integration reveals nonrandom harmonic pattern-summary discontinuities, exposing the comedy tragically advocated by deceitful &/or naive theoreticians who are in part constrained by a dominant culture that clings seemingly religiously to maladaptive traditions such as unjustifiable assumptions of randomness, independence, uniformity, linearity, etc. that are routinely misapplied (for example to conveniently render abstract conceptions mathematically tractable)."

I rest my case.

In my presentation I indicated that the Nature Conservancy had held back information that they could later use for what is currently an unknown purpose. They are working actively with the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) and the chart they presented to the town of Guilford was a cropped version, 1 meter in 2080, of a chart developed by the head of GISS, James Hansen, that continued to 2100 and 4 meters more sea level rise in the next 20 years. That amounts to approximately 16 feet plus a value for storm surge. This rise is considered "almost certain" according to the paper "Paleoclimate Implications of Human Caused Climate Change". This is completely outside the most ridiculous of the prognostications currently out there. Mr. Sutherland needs to respond to this question.

It is quite obvious that the Nature Conservancy has controlled the scientific discussion on this question from the beginning, including the Co-chair of the Governor's steering committee. I am sure it makes it easier to make your point without opposition. Given the vast expenditures associated with Anthropogenic(Man-made) Global Warming (AGW) and Sea Level Rise (SLR) it should be considered prudent to fully understand all sides of the science. It was quite obvious to me, and others, that Mr. Sutherland did not want me to supply the committee with counter information. At least one recommended resource was lambasted by TNC web site for a completely false reason. That was Professor Bob Carter from Australia. I wrote to Bob and told him of the discussion. He has been vilified by many and considers that he must be doing something right to have such attention.

Professor Larry Gould-

Physicist, University of Hartford, Member of Connecticut Climate Realists

This is a group of scientists and engineers in the climate and related disciplines. The group would be pleased to make a presentation to your committee I am sure. His web site is:

<http://uhaweb.hartford.edu/LGOULD/> His email is: lgouldphys@gmail.com I was a member of the group until recently but their focus was somewhat outside of my interests. A member of this group you may know is Art Horn, a former Channel 30 meteorologist.

Professor Bob Carter:

Professor Bob Carter is an adjunct Research Fellow at James Cook University (Queensland). He is a palaeontologist, stratigrapher, marine geologist and environmental scientist with more than 40 years professional experience, James Cook University (Townsville), where he was Professor and Head of School of Earth Sciences between 1981 and 1999.

1. Half of Chapter 4 in my book, Climate: the Counter Consensus (ordering information here: http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1a_CTCC.htm) Sorry, but the book will cost you.

2. A summary paper I prepared in connection with a court case, item 136 on the list of articles here: http://members.iinet.net.au/~glrmc/new_page_1.htm

The web site is full of excellent information on a variety of subjects. The videos are informative and entertaining.

3. The two papers at the link below John Droz, who has just taken a lot of trouble to review sea level change on the eastern US seaboard.

Physicist John Droz of North Carolina

From John Droz, "Following that same philosophy, my two part critique of the 2010 NC "Sea-Level Rise Assessment Report" has just been officially released, so feel free to pass it on to science-oriented parties interested in the sea level rise issue: <<<http://tinyurl.com/4lns7wy>>>."

"The basic theme of my critique is that the **methodology** used in the NC report was fundamentally and fatally flawed." Their website is [here](#).

This is a guest post in Anthony Watts, most read climate blog in the world by John Droz Jr. <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/06/11/science-vs-agw-advocacy-in-north-carolina/>

The North Carolina legislature is working to define how sea level needs to be evaluated because they were misled by certain individuals. The recent story about the Eastern seaboard "Hot Spot" incorporates some of these false predictions.

Anthony Watts-Meteorologist

WattsUp With That is an excellent source of information on all subjects Climate related. Became famous for his analysis of US temperature monitoring stations. Approximately 17% met minimum standards. The rest didn't.

Kirtland Griffin, National Environmental Policy Examiner

There are over 70 articles [here](#). On the second page is an interview with astrophysicist Piers Corbyn of www.WeatherAction.com He is the long range Solar/Lunar weather and climate predictor. There are some articles associated with my folks on "It's the Sun" discussion forum.

Bob Tisdale on ocean heat etc.

I am somewhat reluctant to offer this one as it can be pretty technical. It is about Ocean temperatures and ocean heat content mostly. There is a response here to the so-called Hot Spot report in the Eastern US. <http://bobtisdale.wordpress.com/>

Piers Corbyn, Astrophysicist www.WeatherAction.com

The ultimate weather and climate forecaster. Due to my close (non-financial) association with Piers, I should be able to get you a forecast for free. Piers publishes an Extreme weather forecast each month for the US and an annual Hurricane forecast. His work shows demonstrated skill over years but unfortunately his forecasts are "not lasers but rather a lamp to show the way", in his words. The predictions he has made correctly cannot be put off as being coincidence or so general as to be something likely to happen anyhow. For instance, his seasonal forecast for Europe said it would be extremely cold when the Met Office, the official British Weather Service, said it would be mild. He was right. His other forecasts are more specific to location and date.

Solar Cycle 25

Last but not least is this site that discusses much of the same type of material as in my Solar Forum. We are in solar cycle 24 and its maximum is about 3 years away. It is on track to be one of the smallest, in terms of amplitude, in over 100 years.

Solar Cycle 25: <http://sc25.com/>

I hope I have not overwhelmed the committee with this list. There is so much more.

It is important to understand that the Sun was ruled out as a cause for our recent warming because the IPCC only considered solar irradiance, otherwise known as the solar constant. This determination was made by one solar physicist, Judith Lean, based on some very dodgy science. The alternating magnetic fields have a far greater effect on our climate. Then there is the epistrochoidal orbit of the sun caused the angular momentum of the planets in a 179 year cycle..... Best left for another time.

The IPCC was charged with determining HOW man was influencing the climate not IF. That was their original charge. When the IPCC writes Assessment Reports, they send out the document for review. When they receive the comments, both positive and negative, they may accept or reject any or all. 57% of the negative comments in AR4 were rejected in the critical chapter on the scientific basis without any reason given. The next step is to write the Summary for Policy Makers. It is written by Policy Makers, not necessarily scientists. This report is voted on and issued with **absolutely no review**. The really amazing part is that the next several months are spent going over the huge AR report and **eliminating anything that conflicts with the political document**. That process was in place for all 4 of the previous reports and it was available for all to see on the IPCC website. It has since been removed when people like me pointed it out to the world.

The objective of my research into this debate is to point out that warming is not a likely part of our future. Neither is Sea Level Rise or ocean acidification or a need to cut carbon emissions. When the Sun goes into Solar Cycle 25 the planet will likely go into a very cold phase even beyond that experienced in the rest of the world this past winter. Most solar scientists see this cold spell lasting 100 years or more. Some say Solar Cycle 25 may not even happen for several decades. That would be very serious. Cutting carbon emissions by phasing out coal fired plants that supply more than 50% of the electricity in the US will reduce available power when it will be needed most. Cutting CO2 emissions will do nothing to help the planet. It could reduce the population some.

The only real "evidence" for man made global warming is mathematical models. The head of the IPCC research group, Phil Jones, said in an email exposed last year that none of the models work due to how they handle clouds. He was absolutely correct. Johnathan Shanklin, head of the British Antarctic Survey team meteorology unit, told me the same thing a couple years ago relative to his work. Ask anyone how they know that CO2 emitted by man actually caused the warming that ended about 2002. If they give you an answer, it will likely be the models, that don't work, or it can't be the Sun. Neither is satisfactory. I have invited the head of the GISS, James Hansen, to debate Lord Monckton of Scotland. Lord Monckton was looking forward to it but only Hansen's assistant emailed me asking if her boss had responded. I told her "No", and that was the last I heard from them. So much for open communications...

I would be happy to conduct a presentation to the group on any subject covered here. I am currently working 2 days a week so I am flexible. I can also supply experts on the various subjects.

Yours truly,

Kirtland C. Griffin

638 West Lake Ave.

Guilford, CT 06437

203 453 2793 Home

203 927 1675Cell